

From: Mike Smith <smittynm@hotmail.com>  
 To: <wtc@nist.gov>  
 Subject: Comments on the WTC 7 Draft Reports

Mr. Stephen Cauffman,

Thank you for taking time to review this.

Name: Michael Smith

Affiliation: concerned citizen

Contact: smittynm@hotmail.com

Report Number: NCSTAR 1A

Page Number: 23 (continues on 24)

Paragraph/Sentence: paragraph 2/sentences 6-11

**Comment:** The report is describing hypothetical blast scenarios and states, "The sound from such a blast in a urban setting would have been reflected and channeled down streets with minimum attenuation. The sound would have been attenuated behind buildings, but this would have also generated multiple echoes. These echoes could have extended the time over which the sound could have been detected and could possibly have had an additive effect if multiple in-phase reflections met." There is a video with this exact effect recorded on the soundtrack, available at the following link:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0YvrKfWkxdw>

While the firefighters are talking on the phone, a very loud blast startles them, and another firefighter comes running up and tells them that they "gotta get back seven is exploding." This gives us an approximate time, place, and amplitude of the sound. Clearly, it is very near to Building 7, it occurs before the collapse of Building 7 but long after the collapse of the 2 towers, and it is a very loud sound. After listening again, I clearly heard multiple echoes that slowly died out, which precisely matches the description of reflection and attenuation given in the report.

The report then states, "However, the soundtracks from videos being recorded at the time of the collapse did not contain any sound as intense as would have accompanied such a blast (NIST NCSTAR 1-9, Chapter 5)." This statement is clearly incorrect, given the clear soundtrack of the above video and the criteria described immediately prior to this statement in the report.

The reports goes on, "Therefore, the Investigation Team concluded that there was no demolition-type blast that would have been intense enough to lead to the collapse of WTC 7 on September 11, 2001." This makes it clear that the only evidence considered for controlled demolition was auditory, and the auditory evidence was false, as seen above, so for the Investigation Team has no ground to make this absurd conclusion. In a report by Richard Gage titled "Undisputed Facts Point to the Controlled Demolition of WTC 7" he covers extensive evidence of controlled demolition, including the molten metal and unusually high temperatures present days or weeks after the collapse, the metallurgical study in Appendix C of the FEMA report, the chemical signature of thermate, and the fact that visually the collapse bore a very close resemblance to a controlled demolition. I read this report from a link on the NIST website, so I know it has been brought to the attention of the organization. The information presented is not easily refutable, so for the Investigation Team to only consider auditory evidence, when so much more was available, is criminally negligent.

The most glaring neglect of all the above points brought forth by Gage is the neglect of the government's own recommendations! Appendix C of the FEMA report titled "Limited Metallurgical Examination" studies two metal samples. The first sample was from WTC 7 and they found "evidence of a severe high temperature corrosion attack on the steel, including oxidation and sulfidation with subsequent intergranular melting" in several areas. The report concludes, "The severe corrosion and subsequent erosion of Samples 1 and 2 are a very unusual event. No clear explanation for the source of the sulfur has been identified ... A detailed study into the mechanisms of this phenomenon is needed..." and this was published in 2002! In all the time it took NIST to make its report, surely the Investigation Team could have investigated this, as it seems to pertain directly to the inability of the steel to hold the building up. As stated in the Preface of this NIST report, on pg. xxv, paragraph 4, sentence 1, one of the specific objectives is to determine "why and how Building 7 collapsed." NIST failed at this objective by purposefully ignoring bountiful evidence, especially the evidence presented by FEMA with a recommendation for further research.

**Reason for Comment:** The sentence which claims that "the soundtracks being recorded at the time of the collapse did not contain any sound as intense as would have accompanied such a blast" is false and needs to be corrected. Using this false statement as conclusive evidence that there were no explosives planted is not a logical step to take, and is a criminally negligent step to take in light of all the other evidence of explosives or

other similar products of controlled demolition (such as thermite). I hope that legal action is brought against NIST for this blatant disregard of evidence. It is 2008 already! By this time NIST should have studied and reported on ALL credible evidence and ALL credible hypotheses of collapse.

**Suggestion for Revision:**

The sound from such a blast in a urban setting would have been reflected and channeled down streets with minimum attenuation. The sound would have been attenuated behind buildings, but this would have also generated multiple echoes. These echoes could have extended the time over which the sound could have been detected and could possibly have had an additive effect if multiple in-phase reflections met. This exact phenomena was found on the soundtrack of videotape recorded at the time of the collapse, and is backed up by eye witness testimony recorded at the time of the collapse and in later interviews. Therefore, the Investigation Team concluded that there was a good probability of a demolition-type blast that would have been intense enough to lead to the collapse of WTC 7 on September 11, 2001. Further research and examination of corroborating evidence, such as the chemical signature of thermite and the presence of a eutectic reaction on the steel, will be necessary in the very near future and will be completed promptly.

Thank you again for taking the time to review this,  
Mike Smith

---

Get ideas on sharing photos from people like you. Find new ways to share. [Get Ideas Here!](#)